(4)

BEFORE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition No. 130 2000

Petitioner :- GYAN PRAKASH SELOT
S/o Shri Jeevanlal Selot
aged about 72 years,
r/o Quarter No. 2C, Street 34
Sector-1, Bhilai Steel Plant
Township, Bhilai Nagar,
Teh. & Distt. DURG (Chhattisgarh).

VERSUS.

RESPONDENTS :- 1. HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
Through - Registrar General,
High Court of Madhya Pradesh
Jabalpur (M.P.)

2. STEEL AUTHORITY OF INDIA LIMITED
Through :- Managing Director,
Bhilai Steel Plant,
Steel Authority of India Limited,
ISPAT BHAWAN
Bhilai Nagar,
Teh. & Distt. DURG (Chhattisgarh).

P.R. No. 129 dated 14-12 Applied by Shri N.K. Dangle

PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA.

XI-HC-22

(3)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P. 130/ **सन्** **2006**

..... **विरुद्ध** .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

25-4-2005

On a mention being made the matter is taken up for hearing.

Heard Mr. V.G. Tamaskar, counsel for the petitioner.

The petitioner's case is that on 1-3-1948 he was appointed in the High Court of Judicature at Nagpur, and thereafter, his services were transferred to the High Court of Madhya Pradesh, Jabalpur. Vide order dated 18th March, 1959, the petitioner was sent on deputation to Hindustan Steel Limited, Bhilai, for a period of two years with effect from 1-7-1957 to 31-7-1959, thereafter, the petitioner resigned from the post and that was accepted by the High Court vide order dated 18th December, 1960, thereby the petitioner completed 10 years of continuous service in the service of respondent No.1, therefore, he is entitled to get pro-rata pension as per the rules, which is not being given by respondent No.1 in spite of the repeated representations and reminder. The petitioner had lastly served with respondent No.2 who has his entire service record.

Mr. V.G. Tamaskar, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that number of times, the petitioner made representations to respondent No.1 for fixation of pro-rata pension of the petitioner, even though service record is also called by respondent No.1 from respondent No.2, but respondent No.1 is not passing any order with regard to his request. Therefore, learned counsel further submits that respondent No.1 be

(पीछे देखिये)

(36)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P.130/ **सन्** 2000

..... **विरुद्ध** .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित — 2 —	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

directed to decide the petitioner's representation which is pending with him since 21st April, 2000 (Annexure P-13).

The limited prayer made by learned counsel appears to be just, fair, genuine and reasonable. In the circumstances, respondent No.1 is directed to consider the representation of the petitioner and decide the same after considering all the points raised by the petitioner within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, in accordance with law. It is made clear that if the representation made by the petitioner is not available with respondent No.1 then the petitioner will be at liberty to send a copy of the same to respondent No.1.

With the directions aforesaid, the petition stands disposed of.

Consequently, I.A.Nos.2432/2004 and 5324/2004 also stand disposed of.

Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order.

Sd/-
L.C.BHADOO
Judge

Soma